

REMARKS

Formal Matters

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the present Application. Claims 1-13 are amended. Claim 14 is newly added. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 14 is amply supported by the present disclosure, and introduces no impermissible new matter.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the receipt of priority documents submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 119, initialing the information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on June 23, 2004, and acknowledging the drawings filed on August 27, 2003.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to claims 1 and 5 due to certain informalities. Applicant hereby amends the indicated claims in order to address the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Fredlund and Wheeler in view of Housel

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fredlund et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0146997) and Wheeler et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0095197) further in view of Housel (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,526). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 requires "region specification input sources" which specify "regions . . . at which cropped printing should take place." The regions are specified "based on user input." Claim 1 also requires "one or more cutters which cut . . . using one or more cutting frames established based on at least a portion of at least one of the region or regions specified by at least

one of the region specification input sources.” Claim 1 also requires “one or more printers which print at least a portion of at least one of the processed image or images.”

Thus, although the specified regions are based on user input, and provided by the region specification input sources, it is the printer which actually prints an image. Therefore, in order to conduct borderless printing, it is necessary to cut the image according to the region specified “based on user input.” Moreover, it is clear that the specified region and a region from which an image is actually cut do not match and an image is cut in a larger size than the size of the specified region.

None of Fredlund, Wheeler, or Housel, appear to teach or suggest these features recited in claim 1. The cited references, therefore, fail to render amended claim 1 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Housel and Wheeler in view of Fredlund

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-8 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Housel and Wheeler and further in view of Fredlund. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 2-8 and 10-12 recite features similar to those of claim 1. The deficiencies of Housel, Wheeler, and Fredlund are demonstrated above with respect to claim 1. Satake, moreover, fails to make up for these above-described deficiencies, as Satake still fails to teach the required combination of features as explained above. Thus, Housel, Wheeler, and Fredlund, alone or in combination, still fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 2-8 and 10-12 for reasons analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. These references, therefore, fail to render claims 2-8 and 10-12 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Satake and Wheeler in view of Fredlund

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Satake et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0052997) and Wheeler and further in view of Fredlund. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 recites features similar to those of claim 2. The deficiencies of Wheeler and Fredlund are demonstrated above. Satake, moreover, fails to make up for these above-described deficiencies, as Satake still fails to teach the required combination of features as explained above. Thus, Satake, Wheeler, and Fredlund, alone or in combination, still fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 13. These references, therefore, fail to render claim 13 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This Application is being filed via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS).

Applicants herewith petition the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

Date: December 6, 2007